

BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting

December 14, 2016 – noon-1:00

1777 West Conference Room



Subcommittee Purpose

The Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) Process Subcommittee's Role is to monitor and provide input on the public process throughout the BVCP Update process. The BVCP Committee consists of 2 council members (Weaver, Brockett), 2 planning board members (Gerstle, May), a Boulder County Commissioner (Jones), and a County planning commission member (Gargano).

Attendee: Aaron Brockett, John Gerstle, Leonard May, Lieschen Gargano, Sam Weaver

Staff: Lesli Ellis, Jean Gatzka, Philip Kleisler, Caitlin Zacharias, Jay Sugnet, Steven Giang, Nicole Wobus

Public: (5 members)

***Comments by subcommittee** are the bullet points that begin with bold text.

****Staff responses** are in *italics*.

Proposed Agenda

1. Schedule update (5 minutes) see Attachment A - Schedule

Highlights:

- PB / CC Study Session – Jan 24 to review scenarios, analysis, community engagement results, survey, etc.
- Planning for Jan – Mar

2. Update on recent events (15 minutes)

- Future Choices Forums
 - **Are you putting notification on normal outlets**, e.g. Nextdoor, neighborhood liaison?
 - *Had great direct outreach in North Boulder, including through the direct efforts of community members. Following the first Forum in South Boulder, staff consulted with a member of a neighborhood group to better understand the potential causes of the limited attendance of that event. The member felt there was simply a lot going on, especially in the post-election period, so it could have at least partially been an issue of timing.*
 - **The Election may have changed the focus for some members of the community.**
 - **People may be interested in more specific topics.** But for large-scale topics, there may be less interest.
 - *As more specific proposals come out of the BVCP update, there may be increased interest from the community*
- CU South Meeting
 - **Were the volunteer facilitators** selected from the Public Participation Working Group?
 - The initial invitation was sent to those who applied to the PPWG. Two volunteers asked to facilitate that were not on the initial invitation list.
 - **The meeting was effective**

- **The summaries at the end of the event after the small groups were helpful.** That way others have a sense globally of what else was discussed among the other tables
- **There should be another event around CU South another around Twin Lakes around the time of the draft plan.** The more general events around the entire plan could still have lower attendance.
- Survey
 - *Staff had been hoping for at least 600 responses, which was roughly the amount received*
- Land Use Change Results / Referrals

3. Upcoming Events (10 minutes)

- Gunbarrel Future Choices Forum – Jan 9 - focus on industrial areas
 - **Do we want to make explicit that the IBM land is to be included in the domain that's being discussed?**
 - 1. *This area has not been included in the analysis that we've been doing so far*
 - **It is near the area of change being analyzed,** and there has been little discussion about it. Perhaps it is something to consider.
 - **It is not included in our areas of change.** Could muddy the waters, however.
 - **Regarding targeted outreach** - will you go back and inform industrial users outside of Gunbarrel of the discussion in Gunbarrel? Even if the discussion focuses on Gunbarrel, it could still have implications for industrial users elsewhere, as the market is not just in that locale but over the broader city.
 - 1. *As staff starts aiming in a direction that might involve changes to those areas, they will include businesses, the Boulder Chamber, and others for their feedback and comments on any proposed changes. Staff has heard mixed feedback in discussions thus far- enthusiasm, skepticism, concerned.*
 - **A lot of small businesses are not members of the Boulder Chamber.** Small businesses may not be collectively organized, but they could be impacted by changes to industrial and commercial space. Some business owners are very concerned about that.
 - **Is the Gunbarrel meeting happening for sure?** We should do it (agreed on by several members of the Subcommittee)
 - 1. *Staff will discuss further details with the Subcommittee*
- Boulder County Planning Commission – Jan. 18

4. Website Improvements (10 minutes)

- Materials, questions for Future Choices
 - **Website improvements are working well.** Good to have multiple ways to get to the same content.
 - **Will there be a search function?**
 - *This functionality is part of main city website but cannot be specific only to the BVCP portion of the website*
- Feedback and meeting summaries

5. Considerations for engagement for draft plan (10 minutes)

- **There may be things coming out of the Council retreat that will be relevant to the comp plan e.g. community benefit.** You might remind Council that the comp plan packet is out in mid-January in case it's of interest to address at the Council retreat.
- **Planning Board tomorrow is discussing community benefit. Could Council get a summary of that as part of the packet?** *Yes, as part of the packet for the Jan. 24 Study Session.*
- **There should be an open house or two in other parts of the city to draw people in.** This will be the last main chance for feedback on the draft update.
 - *We can be specific about the topics to be addressed so people know in case it's a topic they want to come talk about*
 - *CU South- will go to Open Space Jan 11, PB Jan 19, topic of conversation at the Study Session (Jan. 24). Will talk about opportunities, constraints, etc.*
 - **Can have the CU south after those touch points because it will have more shape to it at that point.**
 - **Twin Lakes- we'll want to hear from BOCC before we have the next steps for outreach.**
 - *Could have a Subcommittee meeting after next PC meeting – Feb. 1 to discuss*
- **As we publicize meetings,** need to be clear on commitment level of the meetings.

6. Public Comment (10 minutes)

- Boulder Chamber, Elisabeth Patterson- Input from 3 meetings they've hosted. Chamber does hear from the small businesses.
- Michael Caplan – Future Choices Forums – made 2 out of the 3. Variable in terms of why people didn't show. One question- did it not dive deep enough? Maybe members of the community already said their pieces. Can't give people that much quality information – didn't get it until they were there. Choice is- do I listen or do I read through it? Needed a week to read through it. Think about issues – like industrial. Frame it right and work on it that way. Ask people what worked, what didn't? Questionnaires, email. Consider that you might want to have public comment before the meeting, not just after.
- Lynn – need more direct dialogue with the public. I can't afford to do anything until I know where I stand financially. We failed impact fees, people don't know where they stand financially. Property taxes are going to eclipse mortgage. Needs to be a more direct dialogue. Needs to be action on the ground.
- Mike Smith – now Planning Commission will reconsider. Highly skeptical people about how seriously the four bodies take the comp plan. People seem willing to ignore the comp plan. Worst thing would be to get in the middle of changing things in the comp plan – here are the new policies – could be moving the goal posts mid game. Success of the comp plan depends on informed consent. Don't move the goal posts mid process. All the sudden to have a different comp plan would be a new set of rules.
- Donna – Planning Commission reconsideration. Not all members were there, Commissioners didn't get info, lineup was messed up. Process is broken and needs to be fixed. What happened

to Open Space thing public put in? In the Courier- inaccurate representation. You don't have to be a medium or high density residential to be welcoming and inclusive. Where is the truth in the data? Community benefit that's coming up- park and open space is community benefit to the community.

Attachments:

A: Schedule

Next Meeting: Jan. 18